REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 8, 10-13, 20-25, 30, 34, 35, 40, 44, 45, 50, and 54 were pending and presented for examination in this application. In the Office Action dated August 13, 2009, Claims 1, 6, 8, 10-13, 20-25, 30, 34, 35, 40, 44, 45, 50, and 54 were rejected.

Claims 1, 13, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, and 50 have been amended. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

In paragraph 4 of page 3 of the detailed action (hereinafter, "OA"), Examiner rejected Claims 1, 6, 10, 12, 13, 22, 24, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over RFC 3053 (IPv6 Tunnel Broker), in view of Chow et al. (US 7,216,154 B1), further in view of Schneider (US 2008/0016233 A1).

Claims 1, 13, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, and 50 have been amended to more clearly define the present invention. Support for the amendments can be found in the paragraphs [0021], [0030], and [0031] of the specification. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the amended Claims 1, 13, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In paragraph 5 of page 3 of the OA, Examiner asserts that RFC 3053 does not disclose the following features of Claim 1:

> receiving, from the Domain Name System server, at least one name of an IPv6 connect agent determined by the Domain Name System server based on an identifier of the IPv6 enabled node included in the query;
> transmitting a name of a desired IPv6 connect agent to the Domain Name System server; and
> receiving an address of the desired IPv6 connect agent from the Domain Name System server.

Examiner asserts that the above features are disclosed in Abstract, col. 1 lines 15-50, col. 3 lines 13-36 of Chow (page 4, lines 4-10 of the OA). Further, Examiner identifies "the most efficient host" of Chow (corresponding to the "US network host 108" in FIG. 1) as the "desired IPv6 connect agent" of Claim 1 (page 5, line 1 of the OA).

The "network hosts 108-112" of Chow are mirroring network hosts of the "network site 106" (col. 2, lines 25-39 of Chow), and provide mirrored network resources to the "client 1 100" or "client 2 102." For this reason, the "network site 106" and the "network hosts 108-112" are destination nodes with which the "client 1 100" or "client 2 102" communicates through the "network 104," and therefore correspond to the "IPv6 entity 190" of the present invention.

Abstract, col. 1 lines 15-50, col. 3 lines 13-36 of Chow pointed out by Examiner disclose that the "client 1 100" obtains, using "the DNS 1 114," an IP address of the "site 106" or "the most efficient host 108" from the domain name of the "network site 106" that is the destination node. In other words, the "client 1 100" only receives the IP address of the destination node from the "DNS 1 114."

In contrast, the "IPv6 connect agent" of the present invention connects the "IPv6 enabled node" to a network containing IPv4 components, as defined in the amended Claim 1. The "IPv6 enabled node" receives from the "DNS server," not an address of the destination node, but a list of IPv6 connect agents available to the "IPv6 enabled node," as recited in the amended Claim 1.

Thus, Chow fails to disclose the case as assumed in the present invention where the "site 106" and the "client 1 100" are IPv6 enabled nodes, and the "network 104" is an IPv4 network. Further, Chow fails disclose an "IPv6 connect agent" connecting the "client 1 100" to the "network 104."

Finally, "the most efficient host 108" of Chow is not identical to the "IPv6 connect agent" recited in the amended Claim 1. Therefore, Chow does not suggest, teach, or disclose the following features of the amended Claim 1:

> receiving, from the Domain Name System server, a list comprising at least one name of an IPv6 connect agent determined by the Domain Name System server based on an identifier of the IPv6 enabled node included in the query, the IPv6 connect agent connecting the IPv6 enabled node to a network containing IPv4 components;
> transmitting a name of a desired IPv6 connect agent to the Domain Name System server, the name of the desired IPv6 connect agent being selected from the list; and
> receiving an address of the desired IPv6 connect agent from the Domain Name System server.

Accordingly, even if the disclosure of RFC 3053 is modified with that of Chow, only the IP address of the destination node can be obtained from the "DNS server" receiving a query from the source node.

Additionally, Examiner quoted paragraph [0120] of Schneider for the reason that the "client 1 100" of Chow transmits to the "DNS 1 114," not the query, but the domain name of the "site 106" that is the destination node. Paragraph [0120] of Schneider discloses that if a browser receives a keyword, a domain name is automatically generated on the client side or on any server based on the keyword.

Accordingly, even if the disclosure of RFC 3053 is modified with those of Chow and Schneider, the "DNS 1 114" receiving a keyword from the "client 1 100" provides only the IP address of the "site 106" or the "most efficient host 108" corresponding to a domain name automatically generated based on the keyword, not "a list comprising at least one name of an IPv6 connect agent determined by the Domain Name System server based on an identifier of the IPv6 enabled node included in the query" as recited in the amended Claim 1.

For the above reasons, RFC 3053 in view of Chow and Schneider fails to disclose the features of the amended Claim 1:

receiving, from the Domain Name System server, a list comprising at least one name of an IPv6 connect agent determined by the Domain Name System server based on an identifier of the IPv6 enabled node included in the query, the IPv6 connect agent connecting the IPv6 enabled node to a network containing IPv4 components;

transmitting a name of a desired IPv6 connect agent to the Domain Name System server, the name of the desired IPv6 connect agent being selected from the list; and

receiving an address of the desired IPv6 connect agent from the Domain Name System server.

Similar remarks apply to the other amended independent Claims 13, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45 and 50.

Accordingly, none of the three references, alone or in combination, discloses the features of the amended independent Claims 1, 13, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, and 50. Thus, Claims 1, 13, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, and 50 are patentably distinct, and Applicants respectfully request allowance of these claims. Claims 6, 8, 10-12, 20-24, 34, 44, and 54 depend from independent Claims 1, 13, 30, 40, and 50, and therefore include all the limitations of the independent claims; and for at least the reasons set forth above are also patentably distinct over the art of record and in a condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are allowed over the cited art of record for at least the reasons stated above and request that Examiner allow this case.

Respectfully submitted,
HIDETOSHI YOKOTA, ET AL.

Dated: November 4, 2009

/Greg T. Sueoka/

Greg T. Sueoka, Reg. No. 33,800
Attorney for Applicants
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel. (650) 335-7194